

Archaeological Impact Assessment

For The Lotus Fruit Packing Plant and Farm Outlet

Prepared For
Midturon Information Consultants
By



HERITAGE

Contracts and Archaeological Consulting

TEL: +27 82 373 8491. E-MAIL: JACO.HERITAGE@GMAIL.COM

VERSION 1.0
21 January 2014

CLIENT:

Midturion Information Consultants

CONTACT PERSON:

Chris le Roux

✉ PO Box 12158

Clubview, 0014

☎ Phone: (084) 6092881

✉ E-mail: chrisleroux@gmail.com

SIGNATURE: _____

LEADING CONSULTANT:

Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC

CONTACT PERSON:

Jaco van der Walt

Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting

Professional Member of the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologist (#159)

I, Jaco van der Walt as duly authorised representative of Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC, hereby confirm my independence as a specialist and declare that neither I nor the Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC have any interest, be it business, financial, personal or other, in any proposed activity, application or appeal in respect of which the client was appointed as Environmental Assessment practitioner, other than fair remuneration for work performed on this project.



SIGNATURE: _____

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Site name and location: The proposed Lotus Fruit Packing Plant and Farm Outlet (Piet Engelbrecht Trust And Lettie Grundling Trust) is located on the Remainder of Portion 4 of the Farm Mosesriviersmond 27, Registration Division JS, Limpopo Province in the Marble Hall area.

Purpose of the study: Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment to determine the presence of cultural heritage sites and the impact of the proposed project on these resources within the study area.

1:50 000 Topographic Map: 2429 CD

Environmental Consultant: Midturon Information Consultants

Developer: Piet Engelbrecht Trust and Lettie Grundling Trust

Heritage Consultant: Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC (HCAC).

Contact person: Jaco van der Walt Tel: +27 82 373 8491

E –mail jaco.heritage@gmail.com.

Date of Report: 21 January 2014

Findings of the Assessment:

During the Archaeological Impact Assessment no sites of significance was identified. The study area of less than 10 ha is flat and extensively cultivated over generations and this would have obliterated any surface signs of heritage resources. Other studies in the area (Berg 1999, Murimbika 2007, van der Walt 2007 and 2013, showed a lack of heritage sites in the Marblehall area, and this was confirmed for the study area during a comprehensive field survey. From an archaeological point of view there is no reason why the development cannot commence work (based on approval from SAHRA). If during construction any archaeological finds are made (e.g. stone tools, skeletal material), the operations must be stopped, and the archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find.

General

The possible occurrence of unmarked or informal graves and subsurface finds can thus not be excluded. If during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find.

Disclaimer: *Although all possible care is taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of study areas, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study. Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.*

Copyright: Copyright of all documents, drawings and records – whether manually or electronically produced – that form part of the submission, and any subsequent reports or project documents, vests in Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC and on condition that the Client pays to Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:

- The results of the project;
- The technology described in any report;
- Recommendations delivered to the Client.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
ABBREVIATIONS	7
GLOSSARY	7
1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	8
1.1 Terms of Reference.....	9
1.2. Archaeological Legislation and Best Practice	9
1.3 Description of Study Area	11
1.3.1 <i>Location Data</i>	11
1.3.2. <i>Location Map</i>	12
2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	13
2.1 Phase 1 - Desktop Study	13
2.1.1 <i>Literature Search</i>	13
2.1.2 <i>Information Collection</i>	13
2.1.3 <i>Consultation</i>	13
2.1.4 <i>Google Earth and Mapping Survey</i>	13
2.1.5 <i>Genealogical Society of South Africa</i>	13
2.2 Phase 2 - Physical Surveying.....	13
2.3. Restrictions	13
3. NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT	14
4. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AREA.....	14
4.1 Databases Consulted	14
4.2 Archaeological and Historical Information Available on the Study Area	14
4.2.1 Maps Of The Area Under Investigation	15
4.2.2. A Brief History Of Human Settlement And Black And White Interaction In The Marble Hall Area	19
4.2.3. Historical Overview Of The Ownership And Development Of The Farm Mosesriviersmond	27
5. HERITAGE SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND MITIGATION MEASURES	25
5.1. Field Rating of Sites	26
6. BASELINE STUDY-DESCRIPTION OF SITES	27
7. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	29
8. CONCLUSIONS.....	29
9. PROJECT TEAM	29
10. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY.....	30
11. REFERENCES	31

FIGURES

Figure 1: Study area.....	12
Figure 2: Google Earth Image showing the farm area and Marble Hall in relation to Groblersdal, which is located some 25 kilometers from there.(Google Earth 2011)	15
Figure 3: 1909 Major Jackson map of the Bluidefontein district, showing the location of the farm Mosesriviersmond 134. One can see that the “Moos” River runs through the property, and that a district boundary between the Bluidefontein and Middelburg districts forms the eastern border of the farm. Two ordinary roads cross the property, but no other developments are visible. (Major Jackson 1909)	16
Figure 4: 1920s map of the Transvaal, showing the location of Mosesriviersmond 134. The red line indicates that a road ran along the eastern boundary of the farm. (Anon 1920s)	17
Figure 5: Topographical map of the farm Mosesriviersmond 27 JS. Note that the northern part of this map dates to the year 2000, whereas the southern map dates to 1984. Almost the entire property is covered with cultivated land and orchards. The Mosesrivier flows through the property from north to south. One can see that on the 1984 map the river is also referred to as the “Moosrivier”. Several canals flow through the northern and southern parts of the property. One can also see that there are several bodies of perennial water on the land. Several buildings are located alongside the canals, and one can see diggings near the most northeastern corner of the farm. The N11 Freeway intersects the property from west to east and the site of Hereford, together with a shop, are located close to there the Mosesrivier and the road intersects. A school building can be seen near the westernmost border of the property. The town of Marble Hall is located to the northwest of Mosesriviersmond 27 JS. (Topographical Map 2000; Topographical Map 1984)	18
Figure 6: Sketch indicating the subdivision of the farm. (NASA SAB, LDE: 1504 30619/111 [Part 1])	22
Figure 7: Sketch of the proposed business site. (NASA SAB, CDB: 14951 PB4/19/2/19/27/1).....	24
Figure 8: Study area in blue with track logs of the survey.	27
Figure 9. Eastern portion of the study area.....	28
Figure 10. Study area viewed from the north.....	28
Figure 11. General site conditions of the study area.	28
Figure 12. Study area viewed from the west.....	28

ABBREVIATIONS

AIA: Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMP: Environmental Management Plan
ESA: Early Stone Age
GPS: Global Positioning System
HIA: Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA: Late Iron Age
LSA: Late Stone Age
MEC: Member of the Executive Council
MIA: Middle Iron Age
MPRDA: Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act
MSA: Middle Stone Age
NEMA: National Environmental Management Act
PRHA: Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SADC: Southern African Development Community
SAHRA: South African Heritage Resources Agency

**Although EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age both are internationally accepted abbreviations and must be read and interpreted in the context it is used.*

GLOSSARY

Archaeological site (remains of human activity over 100 years old)

Early Stone Age (~ 2.6 million to 250 000 years ago)

Middle Stone Age (~ 250 000 to 40-25 000 years ago)

Later Stone Age (~ 40-25 000, to recently, 100 years ago)

The Iron Age (~ AD 400 to 1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Kind of study</i>	Archaeological Impact Assessment
<i>Type of development</i>	Fruit Packing Plant
<i>Developer:</i>	Piet Engelbrecht Trust and Lettie Grundling Trust
<i>Consultant:</i>	Midturion Information Consultants

The Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) report forms part of the Basic Assessment for the proposed project.

The aim of the study is to identify cultural heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within local, provincial and national context. It serves to assess the impact of the proposed project on non-renewable heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner. It is also conducted to protect, preserve, and develop such resources within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).

The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized before and during the survey, which includes: Phase 1, a review of the heritage scoping report that includes collection from various sources and consultations; Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey no heritage sites were identified. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations, and site descriptions. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report.

This report must also be submitted to the appropriate SAHRA provincial office for peer review.

1.1 Terms of Reference

Desktop study

Conducting a brief desktop study where information on the area is collected to provide a background history of the area.

Field study

Conduct a field study to: a) systematically survey the proposed project area to locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest; b) record GPS points identified as significant areas; c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area.

Reporting

Report on the identification of anticipated and cumulative impacts the operational units of the proposed project activity may have on the identified heritage resources for all 3 phases of the project; i.e., construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Consider alternatives, should any significant sites be impacted adversely by the proposed project. Ensure that all studies and results comply with Heritage legislation and the code of ethics and guidelines of ASAPA.

To assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, and to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).

1.2. Archaeological Legislation and Best Practice

Phase 1, an AIA or a HIA is a pre-requisite for development in South Africa as prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by legislation. The overall purpose of a heritage specialist input is to:

- Identify any heritage resources, which may be affected;
- Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources;
- Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;
- Assess the negative and positive impact of the development on these resources;
- Make recommendations for the appropriate heritage management of these impacts.

The AIA or HIA, as a specialist sub-section of the EIA, is required under the National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999), Section 23(2)(b) of the NEMA and sections 39(3)(b)(iii) of the MPRDA.

The AIA should be submitted, as part of the EIA, BIA or EMP, to the PHRA if established in the province or to SAHRA. SAHRA will be ultimately responsible for the professional evaluation of Phase 1 AIA reports upon which review comments will be issued. 'Best practice' requires Phase 1 AIA reports and additional development information, as per the EIA, BIA/EMP, to be submitted in duplicate to SAHRA after completion of the study. SAHRA accepts Phase 1 AIA reports authored by professional archaeologists, accredited with ASAPA or with a proven ability to do archaeological work.

Minimum accreditation requirements include an Honours degree in archaeology or related discipline and 3 years post-university CRM experience (field supervisor level).

Minimum standards for reports, site documentation and descriptions are set by ASAPA in collaboration with SAHRA. ASAPA is a legal body, based in South Africa, representing professional archaeology in the SADC region. ASAPA is primarily involved in the overseeing of ethical practice and standards regarding the archaeological profession. Membership is based on proposal and secondment by other professional members.

Phase 1 AIAs are primarily concerned with the location and identification of sites situated within a proposed development area. Identified sites should be assessed according to their significance. Relevant conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations should be made. Recommendations are subject to evaluation by SAHRA.

Conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations, as approved by SAHRA, are to be used as guidelines in the developer's decision making process.

Phase 2 archaeological projects are primarily based on salvage/mitigation excavations preceding development destruction or impact on a site. Phase 2 excavations can only be conducted with a permit, issued by SAHRA to the appointed archaeologist. Permit conditions are prescribed by SAHRA and includes (as minimum requirements) reporting back strategies to SAHRA and deposition of excavated material at an accredited repository.

In the event of a site conservation option being preferred by the developer, a site management plan, prepared by a professional archaeologist and approved by SAHRA, will suffice as minimum requirement.

After mitigation of a site, a destruction permit must be applied for from SAHRA by the client before development may proceed.

Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act, with reference to Section 36. Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983), and are the jurisdiction of SAHRA. The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36[5]) of Act 25 of 1999) is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in this age category, located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority, require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years, in addition to SAHRA authorisation. If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery, but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws, set by the cemetery authority, must be adhered to.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected under Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance no. 7 of 1925), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983), and are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial MEC for Local Government and Planning; or in some cases, the MEC for Housing and Welfare.

Authorisation for exhumation and reinterment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. To handle and transport human remains, the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of Act 65 of 1983 (Human Tissues Act).

1.3 Description of Study Area

1.3.1 Location Data

The proposed Lotus Fruit Packing Plant and Farm Outlet is located on the Remainder of Portion 4 of the Farm Mosesriviersmond 27 JS, in the Marble Hall area, Limpopo Province. The site is located approximately 4.7 km east from Marble Hall. The site is accessible by road coming of the N11. This road also forms the eastern boundary of the study area.

1.3.2. Location Map




Figure 1: Study area.

2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The aim of the study is to cover archaeological databases and historical sources to compile a background history of the study area followed by field verification; this was accomplished by means of the following phases.

2.1 Phase 1 - Desktop Study

The first phase comprised a desktop study, gathering data to compile a background history of the area in question. It included scanning existing records for archaeological sites, historical sites and graves, on the inhabitants of the area.

2.1.1 Literature Search

Utilising data for information gathering stored in the archaeological database at Wits, previous CRM reports done in the area and a short literature search. The aim of this is to extract data and information on the area in question, looking at archaeological sites, historical sites, graves, architecture, oral history and ethnographical information on the inhabitants of the area.

2.1.2 Information Collection

The SAHRA report mapping project (Version 1.0) and SAHRIS was consulted to collect data from previously conducted CRM projects in the region to provide a comprehensive account of the history of the study area.

2.1.3 Consultation

No consultation was conducted by the heritage team as this is conducted as part of the BA.

2.1.4 Google Earth and Mapping Survey

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where sites of heritage significance might be located.

2.1.5 Genealogical Society of South Africa

The database of the Genealogical Society was consulted to collect data on any known graves in the area.

2.2 Phase 2 - Physical Surveying

A field survey of the study area of approximately 9 Ha was conducted; focussing on drainage lines, hills and outcrops, high lying areas and disturbances in the topography. The study area was surveyed on foot by a professional archaeologist on 1 Augustus 2013.

2.3. Restrictions

Due to the fact that most cultural remains may occur below surface, the possibility exists that some features or artefacts may not have been discovered/ recorded during the survey. Low archaeological visibility is due to extensive ground disturbance, illegal dumping and vegetation, and the possible occurrence of unmarked graves and other cultural material cannot be excluded. Although Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC surveyed the area as thoroughly as possible, it is incumbent upon the developer to stop operations and inform the relevant heritage agency should further cultural

remains, such as unmarked graves, stone tool scatters, artefacts, bones or fossils, be exposed during the process of development.

3. NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The proposed project consists of the following:

- Construction of a new fruit packing plant and
- farm outlet

4. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AREA

4.1 Databases Consulted

Wits Archaeological Data Bases

No previously recorded sites are on record for the 2429 CD topographic map at the Wits database.

SAHRA Report Mapping Project

The SAHRIS and the SAHRA Report Mapping project (version 1) have several studies conducted within a radius of 10 km of the study area (van der Walt 2007 and 2013, Murimbika 2007). No archaeological sites were recorded during these assessments.

Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

Neither the Genealogical Society nor the monuments database at Google Earth (Google Earth also include some archaeological sites and historical battlefields) have any recorded sites in the study area.

4.2 Archaeological and Historical Information Available on the Study Area

The following report will endeavour to give an account of the history of this property and also a brief overview of the history of the area and district in which it is located. The report has been divided into several sections that will focus on the following aspects:

General history of human settlement in the area

The history of black and white interaction in the farm area

The development of the farm

It was necessary to use a range of sources in order to give an accurate account of the history of the area in which the farm is located. Sources included secondary source material, maps, online sources and archival documents. This study is by no means all-inclusive, and there are doubtlessly still sources to be found on the history of the property and area researched in this study. Owing to the constraints in time and resources, this study should be viewed as an introduction to the history of the Marble Hall area and the specific farm under investigation.

4.2.1 Maps of The Area Under Investigation

Since the mid 1800's up until the present, South Africa had been subdivided into various different districts. Since 1857, the site where the present-day Marble Hall is located formed part of the Lydenburg District. From 1872, the farm under investigation would have fallen under the jurisdiction of the Middelburg District. By 1902 Marble Hall was still located in the Middelburg district, in the Selonsrivier ward. In 1909 the farm Mosesriviersmond 134 was classified by the Surveyor General, Major Jackson, as forming part of the Bluidefontein district. (Major Jackson 1909) It was only in 1977 when the Republic of South Africa was formally divided into Magisterial Districts. Marble Hall, which up until this time fell under the jurisdiction of the Middelburg district, now formed part of the Groblersdal magisterial district. This was still the case by 1994. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 17, 20-21, 23-27)




Figure 2: Google Earth Image showing the farm area and Marble Hall in relation to Groblersdal, which is located some 25 kilometers from there.(Google Earth 2011)





Figure 3: 1909 Major Jackson map of the Bluidfontein district, showing the location of the farm Mosesriviersmond 134. One can see that the “Moos” River runs through the property, and that a district boundary between the Bluidfontein and Middelburg districts forms the eastern border of the farm. Two ordinary roads cross the property, but no other developments are visible. (Major Jackson 1909)



REFERENCES .






- Roads shewn thus 
- Rivers..... 
- Railways..... 
- Districts..... 

Figure 4: 1920s map of the Transvaal, showing the location of Mosesriviersmond 134. The red line indicates that a road ran along the eastern boundary of the farm. (Anon 1920s)



REFERENCE	VERKLARING	REFERENCE	VERKLARING
International Boundaries	Internasionale Grense	Trig. Beacons (Number and ground height)	Trig. Bakens (Nommer en grondhoogte)
Provincial Boundaries	Provinsiale Grense	Magnetic Stations and Ground Signs	Magnetiese Stasies en Grondtekens
Multiple Track Railways	Veelvoudige Spoorlyne	Monuments	Monumente
Single Track Railways	Enkelspoorlyne	Dipping Tanks	Dipbakke
Electrified Railways	Geëlektrifiseerde Spoorlyne	Windmills	Windpompe
Narrow Gauge Railways	Smalspoorlyne	Walls	Mure
Service Railways	Dienspoorlyne	Anti-erosion Walls	Grondbewaringswalle
Freeways and Arterial Roads	Deurpaaië en Hoofverkeerspaaië	Excavations	Uitgrawings
Main Roads	Hoofpaaië	Perennial Water	Standhoudende Water
Secondary Roads	Sekondêre Paaië	Non-perennial Water	Nie-standhoudende Water
Other Roads	Ander Paaië	Dry Pans	Droë Panne
Tracks and Hiking Trails	Dowwe Paaië en Voetslaanpaaië	Springs, Waterholes and Wells	Fonteine, Watergate en Putte
Power Lines	Dowwe Paaië en Voetslaanpaaië	Marshes, Swamps and Vleis	Moerasse en Vleie
Telephone Lines	Telefoonlyne	Pipelines	Pyblyne
Post Offices, Police Stations and Posts	Poskantore, Polisiestasies en -poste	Prominent Rock Outcrops	Prominente Klipbanke
Stores, Hotels, Schools and	Winkels, Hotelle, Skole en	Terraces	Terrasse
Places of Worship	Plekke van Aanbidding	Cultivated Lands	Bewerkte Lande
Lighthouses and Marine Lights	Vuurtorings en Seevaartligte	Orchards and Vineyards	Boorde en Wingerde
Marine Beacons	Seevaartbakens	Trees and Bush	Bome en Bos

Figure 5: Topographical map of the farm Mosesriviersmond 27 JS. Note that the northern part of this map dates to the year 2000, whereas the southern map dates to 1984. Almost the entire property is covered with cultivated land and orchards. The Mosesrivier flows through the property from north to south. One can see that on the 1984 map the river is also referred to as the "Moosrivier". Several canals flow through the northern and

southern parts of the property. One can also see that there are several bodies of perennial water on the land. Several buildings are located alongside the canals, and one can see diggings near the most northeastern corner of the farm. The N11 Freeway intersects the property from west to east and the site of Hereford, together with a shop, are located close to there the Mosesrivier and the road intersects. A school building can be seen near the westernmost border of the property. The town of Marble Hall is located to the northwest of Mosesriviersmond 27 JS. (Topographical Map 2000; Topographical Map 1984)

4.2.2. A Brief History of Human Settlement And Black And White Interaction In The Marble Hall Area

A farm does not exist in isolation, and it is important to understand the social history of the surrounding area. It is essential to consider the history of towns in the vicinity of the property under investigation, since these social centres would have affected those individuals living close by. The city of Marble Hall is of obvious significance, as it is located very close to the Mosesriviersmond 27 JS. The history of this area will be discussed.

J. S. Bergh's historical atlas of the four northern provinces of South Africa is a very useful source for the writing of local and regional histories. No signs of Stone Age or Iron Age terrains are present in the vicinity of Marble Hall. (Geskiiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 4-5, 7)

No major black tribes seem to have settled near the area where Marble Hall is located today by the start of the nineteenth century, but the Kôpa Tribe was prominent in the area to the south thereof. (Geskiiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 10) In a few decades, the sociographic nature of the then Transvaal province would change forever. The Difaqane (Sotho), or Mfekane ("the crushing" in Nguni) was a time of bloody upheavals in Natal and on the Highveld, which occurred around the early 1820's until the late 1830's. (Geskiiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 109-115) It came about in response to heightened competition for land and trade, and caused population groups like gun-carrying Griquas and Shaka's Zulus to attack other tribes. (Geskiiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 14; 116-119) Ndebele raiders moved through the area and displaced the Kôpa and various other tribes. (Geskiiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 110-111) It is not known if these events had a great influence on the area where the farm under investigation is located today, but it is important to understand the social dynamics of this area.

During the time of the Difaqane, a northwards migration of white settlers from the Cape was also taking place. Some travellers, missionaries and adventurers had gone on expeditions to the northern areas in South Africa – some as early as in the 1720's. One such an adventurer was Robert Scoon, who formed part of a group of Scottish travellers and traders who had travelled the northern provinces of South Africa in the late 1820s and early 1830s. Scoon had gone on two long expeditions in the late 1820s and once again ventured eastward and northward of Pretoria in 1836. During this journey, he passed close by the area where Marble Hall is located today. (Geskiiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 13, 116-121)

By the late 1820's, a mass-movement of Dutch speaking people in the Cape Colony started advancing into the northern areas. This was due to feelings of mounting dissatisfaction caused by economical and other circumstances in the Cape.

This movement later became known as the Great Trek. This migration resulted in a massive increase in the extent of that proportion of modern South Africa dominated by people of European descent. (Ross 2002: 39) As can be expected, the movement of whites into the northern provinces would have a significant impact on the black people who populated the land. By 1860, the population of whites in the central Transvaal was already very dense and the administrative machinery of their leaders was firmly in place. Many of the policies that would later be entrenched as legislation during the period of apartheid had already been developed. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 170)

Much can be said about the systematic oppression of black people in South Africa. In 1904 about a half of the black population in the Transvaal was living on private land, owned by whites or companies. According to the Squatters' Law of 1895, no more than five families of "natives" could live on any farm or divided portion of a farm, without special permission of the Government in the Transvaal. (Massie 1905: 97) In Bergh's source, one can see a map indicating the areas where blacks had settled by 1904. It is interesting that there were no black settlements in the Bethal District, and very few in the surrounding districts. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 41) One can estimate that most black families would probably have lived and worked on private farms owned by white farmers. The 1913 and 1936 Acts delimited areas of land where a number of black "homelands" were established. The 1936 Act proclaimed land directly to the west, north and east of Marble Hall as "Native Trust" land. By 1993 a large area to the northeast of Marble Hall was known as the autonomous black state of Lebowa. Other parts of Lebowa, Bophuthatswana and KwaNdebele were located to the southwest of Marble Hall. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 42-43)

Black and white relations were however at times also interdependent in nature. After the Great Trek, when white farmers had settled at various areas in the northern provinces, wealthier farmers were often willing to lodge needy white families on their property in exchange for odd jobs and commando service. This bywoner often arrived with a family and a few cows. He would till the soil and pay a minimal rent to the farmer from the crops he grew. The farmer did not consider him a laborer, but mostly kept black workers for hard labour on the farm. After the Anglo-Boer War, many families were left destitute. Post war years of severe droughts and locust plagues did not ameliorate this state of affairs. All of these factors resulted in what became known as the 'poor white problem'. On the advent of commercial farming in South Africa, white landowners soon found bywoners to be a financial burden, and many were evicted from farms. In many cases, wealthier landlords found it far more profitable to rent their land to blacks than to bywoners. This enabled them to create reservoirs of black labour (for which mine recruiting agencies were prepared to pay handsome commissions), while it was also possible to draw more rent from their black tenants. This practice was outlawed by the 1913 Natives Land Act, which forbade more than five black families from living on white farms as peasant squatters. (Readers Digest 1992: 329-332)

The discovery of diamonds and gold in the northern provinces had very important consequences for South Africa. After the discovery of these resources, the British, who at the time had colonized the Cape and Natal, had intentions of expanding their territory into the northern Boer republics. This eventually led to the Anglo-Boer War, which took place between 1899 and 1902 in South Africa, and which was one of the most turbulent times in South Africa's history. Even before the outbreak of war in October 1899 British politicians, including Sir Alfred Milner and Mr. Chamberlain, had declared that should Britain's differences with the Z.A.R. result in violence, it would mean the end of republican independence. This decision was not immediately publicized, and as a consequence republican leaders based their assessment of British intentions on the more moderate public utterances of British leaders. Consequently, in March 1900,

they asked Lord Salisbury to agree to peace on the basis of the status quo ante bellum. Salisbury's reply was, however, a clear statement of British war aims. (Du Preez 1977)

The skirmish that took place closest to where Marble Hall is located today is the battle at Vrieskraal. The British Commander, W. Kitchener, attacked the Boer troops of Commandant Muller on 16 Augustus 1901. (Geschiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika 1999: 54)

4.2.3. Historical Overview Of The Ownership And Development Of The Farm Mosesriviersmond 27 Js

In March 1940 the South African government started negotiations with the owners of the farm Mosesriviersmond No. 134 - A.J, H.L and D.V.S Neethling and Mrs. J.J Stainton - in order to acquire Portion A of the land as part of the Loskop Irrigation Scheme. The negotiations were however unsuccessful, as the owners decided to subdivide the farm. Subsequently, the landowners only allowed a servitude to be used by the government as part of the irrigation scheme. The government agreed to these terms on 1st April 1947. (NASA SAB, LDE: 1504 30619/111 [Part 1])




Figure 6: Sketch indicating the subdivision of the farm. (NASA SAB, LDE: 1504 30619/111 [Part 1])

On 14 December 1942 Mr. G.S Labuschagne and Mr. A.J Louwrens were the owners of Portion B (northern half) of the farm Mosesriviersmond (134, 337.8409 morgen in extent). On this date these individuals gave their consent to the

government to register a servitude on a section of their land as part of the Irrigation Scheme. (NASA SAB, LDE: 1529 30619/112)

In September 1947 the two owners requested to have the land divided equally between them and this was approved by the government. (NASA SAB, LDE: 1529 30619/112)

On 22 April 1948, Portion 10 and 11 of the farm Mosesriviersmond 134, owned at that time by Hendrik Rudolph Neethling, was sold to Hendrik Frederik Grobler for the amount of £11 000.00. The two portions together measured 195.6939 morgen. (NASA SAB, LDE: 1504 30619/111 [Part 2])

On 22 May 1951 a request was made by the government to acquire a certain portion (southern part of Portion 7) of the farm Mosesriviersmond 134 to be used for the Loskop Irrigation Scheme. This was due to the fact that the portion formed part of the State Irrigation Area. (NASA SAB, URU: 2873 1195)

On 16 August 1973, Hendrik Frederik Grobler sold Portion 10 and 11 (Portion of Portion 3) of the farm Mosesriviersmond 27 JS, which were respectively 84.6119 and 80.0062 morgen in extent, to Willem Abraham Engelbrecht. The condition remained that a servitude for the irrigation scheme would still be in place, as this was the agreement with the government. (NASA SAB, CDB: 14951 PB4/19/2/19/27/1)

In some instances the Mosesrivier was also referred to as the "Moos River". On 31 December 1973 a licence was granted to one Theo Mynhardt to operate a general dealer shop on "134 Moosrivier Mond, Marble Hall". This is very likely the farm Mosesriviersmond No. 134. This shop was known as the "Moosrivier Kontantwinkel". He had also received permission to sell "Bantu beer" on the property. In the application for this licence it was indicated that the closest church, school and liquor store were all located five miles from the business site. (NASA SAB, BAO: 8925 A7/11/1236/11)

The Department of Industries, Commerce and Tourism noticed that "unsightly trading" was taking place on Mosesriviersmond 27 JS by August 1982. Second-hand vehicle and car wrecks were kept on the property. Consequently an application was filed for business rights on the farm. This was done with the view of repairing and selling vehicles. No further communication in this regard is mentioned. (NASA SAB, CDB: 14951 PB4/19/2/19/27/1)

On March 11 1985, temporary permission was granted for the operation of a business on Portion 11 of Mosesriviersmond, given that no buildings would be constructed within 95 meters of the main road. A fence would also have to be erected at the owner's cost, and no vehicle wrecks should be visible from the road – all were to be kept inside a salvage yard with concrete walls. The business operator applied for temporary business rights again in 1986 and 1987. Unfortunately it was not possible to ascertain who the business owner was. (NASA SAB, CDB: 14951 PB4/19/2/19/27/1)




Figure 7: Sketch of the proposed business site. (NASA SAB, CDB: 14951 PB4/19/2/19/27/1)

5. HERITAGE SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The presence and distribution of heritage resources define a 'heritage landscape'. In this landscape, every site is relevant. In addition, because heritage resources are non-renewable, heritage surveys need to investigate an entire project area, or a representative sample, depending on the nature of the project. In the case of the proposed development the local extent of its impact necessitates a representative sample and only the footprint of the areas demarcated for development were surveyed. In all initial investigations, however, the specialists are responsible only for the identification of resources visible on the surface.

This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites.

The following criteria were used to establish site significance:

- » The unique nature of a site;
- » The integrity of the archaeological/cultural heritage deposits;
- » The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site;
- » The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features;
- » The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined/is known);
- » The preservation condition of the sites;
- » Potential to answer present research questions.

Furthermore, The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999, Sec 3) distinguishes nine criteria for places and objects to qualify as 'part of the national estate' if they have cultural significance or other special value. These criteria are:

- » Its importance in/to the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- » Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- » Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- » Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- » Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- » Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- » Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- » Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa;
- » Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

5.1. Field Rating of Sites

Site significance classification standards prescribed by SAHRA (2006), and approved by ASAPA for the SADC region, were used for the purpose of this report. The recommendations for each site should be read in conjunction with section 7 of this report.

FIELD RATING	GRADE	SIGNIFICANCE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; national site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; provincial site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High significance	Conservation; mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High significance	Mitigation (part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP.A)	-	High/medium significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP.B)	-	Medium significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	-	Low significance	Destruction

6. BASELINE STUDY-DESCRIPTION OF SITES

The area is extensively ploughed and under irrigation. The extensive agricultural activities would have destroyed any evidence of archaeological sites.

Almost no archaeological sites are on record for the immediate study area and none were identified in the study area. Other studies in the larger study area indicated that the archaeological record is characterised by Iron Age stone walled settlements found to the north east and south of the study area. Several Stone Age sites are on record to the south east at Loskop Dam. No traces of any archaeological remains were identified and no buildings older than 60 years exist on site. A search on archaeological data bases also yielded no known sites within the study area and no heritage significant sites were identified during the desktop study. The lack of heritage sites was confirmed during a field survey (Figure 2).



Figure 8: Study area in blue with track logs of the survey.



Figure 9. Eastern portion of the study area.



Figure 10. Study area viewed from the north.



Figure 11. General site conditions of the study area.



Figure 12. Study area viewed from the west.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

No sites of heritage significance were identified during the survey, this concurs with the findings of other heritage studies done in the greater study area. However, if during construction, any archaeological finds are made (e.g. stone tools, skeletal material), the operations must be stopped, and the archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the finds. No buildings exist on the site and no cultural landscape elements were noted. Visual impacts to scenic routes and sense of place are slightly higher due to the projects close proximity to the road but are still negligible. No further mitigation is recommended for this aspect.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Almost no archaeological sites are on record for the immediate study area and none were identified in the study area. Other studies in the larger study area indicated that the archaeological record is characterised by Iron Age stone walled settlements found to the north east and south of the study area. Several Stone Age sites are on record to the south east at Loskop Dam. No archaeological sites were identified during the survey and desktop study, no red flags were identified. There is from a heritage point of view no reason why the development cannot commence work (based on approval from SAHRA).

9. PROJECT TEAM

Jaco van der Walt, Project Manager and archaeologist

Liesl Bester, Archival Specialist

10. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY

I (Jaco van der Walt) am a member of ASAPA (no 159), and accredited in the following fields of the CRM Section of the association: Iron Age Archaeology, Colonial Period Archaeology, Stone Age Archaeology and Grave Relocation. This accreditation is also valid for/acknowledged by SAHRA and AMAFA.

Currently, I serve as Council Member for the CRM Section of ASAPA, and have been involved in research and contract work in South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Tanzania as well as the DRC; having conducted more than 300 AIAs since 2000.

11. REFERENCES

Du Preez, S. J. Peace attempts during the Anglo Boer War until March 1901. Magister Artium thesis in History. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies. Edited by J. S. Bergh. 1999. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Uitgewers.

Massie, R. H. 1905. *The Native tribes of Transvaal. Prepared for the General Staff War Office.* London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Readers Digest. 1992. Illustrated history of South Africa. The Real Story. Expanded second edition: completely updated. Cape Town: Readers Digest Association.

Ross, R. 2002. *A concise history of South Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. The vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SANBI, Pretoria.

National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999)

SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009

Wits Archaeological Database (referenced 2009)

Archival Sources

National Archives of South Africa. 1936-1947. SAB, LDE: 1504 30619/111 (Part 1). *Gedeelte A van die noordelike halwe gedeelte van Mosesriviersmond Nommer 134, Groblersdal.*

National Archives of South Africa. 1938-1951. SAB, LDE: 1529 30619/112. *Loskop Besproeiingskema. Resterende Gedeelte van Gedeelte B van noordelike halwe van Mosesriviersmond Nommer 134.*

National Archives of South Africa. 1951. SAB, URU: 2873 1195. *Loskop Irrigation Scheme: Servitudes – Ptn 7 of Mosesriviersmond No 134, Groblersdal.*

National Archives of South Africa. 1973. SAB, BAO: 8925 A7/11/1236/11. *Algemene Handelaars. (Bantoebier). Groblersdal. T. Mynhardt. Moosrivier.*

National Archives of South Africa. 1984-1987. SAB, CDB: 14951 PB4/19/2/19/27/1. *Plaaslike Bestuur. Gemeenskapsvorming. Besigheidsregte. Groblersdal. Gedeelte 11 (gedeelte van Gedeelte 3) Mosesriviersmond 27 JS.*

National Archives of South Africa. SAB, LDE: 1504 30619/111 (Part 2). *Gedeelte A van die noordelike halwe gedeelte van Mosesriviersmond Nommer 134, Groblersdal.*

Maps

Anon. 1920s. *The standard map of the Transvaal. Compiled from registered diagrams and information supplied by the various landowners and from other authentic sources. Johannesburg: The Map Office.*

Major Jackson, H. M. 1909. *Transvaal Official Maps. First Series 986. Sheet No. 12. Bluidefontein.* Pretoria: Surveyor-General's Office.

Topographical Map. 2000. *South Africa. 1:50 000 Sheet. 2429CD Marble Hall. Third Edition Pretoria: Government Printer.*

Topographical Map. 1984. *South Africa. 1:50 000 Sheet. 2529CD Groblersdal. Second Edition Pretoria: Government Printer.*

Electronic Sources:

MAPS

Google Earth. 2011. 24°58'36.08 S 29°17'27.97" E elev 914 m. [Online]. [Cited 14 June 2013].

Google Earth. 2011. 25°00'07.52 S 29°18'11.19" E elev 913 m. [Online]. [Cited 14 June 2013].